

## REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 10, 21 and 30 without prejudice. Claims 1-9, 11-20, 22-29 and 31 are pending. Claims 1, 12 and 23 are amended. No new matter has been added by the claim amendments.

### 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 12-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant respectfully submits that, as amended, Claims 12-20 and 22 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 1-9, 12-20 and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,892,231 ("Jager"). The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-9, 12-20 and 23-29 are not shown or suggested by Jager.

Applicant respectfully agrees with the statement on page 11 of the Office Action, that Jager does not disclose a file-specific setting comprising display window size and position with respect to the application. Consequently, Jager does not show or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claims 1, 12 and 23.

U.S. Patent No. 6,825,860 ("Hu") is cited to overcome the shortcomings of Jager. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Hu does not overcome the shortcomings of Jager. Hu appears to describe resizing and rescaling an image

in response to user input. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Hu (alone or in combination with Jager) does not show or suggest, once the image has been resized and rescaled, that any resulting image-specific (e.g., file-specific) settings are saved in lieu of global settings, such that when the image (e.g., file) is subsequently displayed, the file-specific settings are used instead of global settings.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Jager, alone or in combination with Hu, does not show or suggest “opening said file using a software application, wherein associated with said file are global settings that are applied to said file when contents of said file are rendered for display, ... wherein said file is rendered in a first window having a first size and a first position in a display screen; saving a file-specific setting defined for said file, ... wherein said file-specific setting establishes at least one of a second size and second position for a window, said second size and said second position different from said first size and said first position; ... and upon subsequent opening of said file, applying said file-specific setting to said display of said contents of said file, said file-specific setting superseding a corresponding global setting for said file, wherein as a result of said file-specific setting said file is rendered in a second window having at least one of said second size and said second position in said display screen” as recited in independent Claim 1 (emphases added) and as similarly recited in independent Claims 12 and 23.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Jager, even in combination with Hu, does not show or suggest the limitations of independent Claims 1, 12 and 23. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the basis for rejecting

Claims 1, 12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed and that Claims 1, 12 and 23 are in condition for allowance. Also, Applicant respectfully asserts that the basis for rejecting Claims 2-9, 13-20 and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed and that Claims 2-9, 13-20 and 24-29 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 11, 22 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jager in view of Hu. Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 11, 22 and 31 are patentable over Jager in view of Hu.

Claims 11, 22 and 31 are dependent on either Claim 1, 12 or 23 and recite additional limitations. As presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 12 and 23 are not shown or suggested by Jager and Hu and that these claims are allowable over Jager and Hu. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the basis for rejecting Claims 11, 22 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and that Claims 11, 22 and 31 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims.

#### Conclusions

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-9, 11-20, 22-29 and 31 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES L.L.P.



Dated: 8/14, 2007

---

William A. Zarbis  
Registration No. 46,120

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113